



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,874	11/14/2002	Jasnid Tanha	11054-1	8696

25277 7590 07/11/2005

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL OF CANADA  
1500 MONTREAL ROAD  
BLDG M-58, ROOM EG12  
OTTAWA, ONTARIO, K1A 0R6  
CANADA

EXAMINER

BLANCHARD, DAVID J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1643

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **NEW CENTRAL FAX NUMBER**

Effective July 15, 2005

On July 15, 2005, the Central FAX Number will change to **571-273-8300**. This new Central FAX Number is the result of relocating the Central FAX server to the Office's Alexandria, Virginia campus.

Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number. To give customers time to adjust to the new Central FAX Number, faxes sent to the old number (703-872-9306) will be routed to the new number until September 15, 2005.

After September 15, 2005, the old number will no longer be in service and **571-273-8300** will be the only facsimile number recognized for "centralized delivery".

**CENTRALIZED DELIVERY POLICY:** For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), and facsimile transmissions must be sent to the Central FAX number, unless an exception applies. For example, if the examiner has rejected claims in a regular U.S. patent application, and the reply to the examiner's Office action is desired to be transmitted by facsimile rather than mailed, the reply must be sent to the Central FAX Number.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/031,874	TANHA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David J. Blanchard	1643	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David J. Blanchard.

(3) Margaret McKay.

(2) Larry R. Helms.

(4) Jasnid Tanha.

Date of Interview: 07 July 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 25-30.

Identification of prior art discussed: Frenken et al [a] and [b] and Casterman et al, already of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


LARRY R. HELMS, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The substance of the interview focused on claim 25 and the art of Frenken et al [a] and [b] and Casterman et al as cited in the Office Action mailed 5/3/2005. Applicant argued that the art of Frenken et al [a] and [b] and Casterman are directed to VHH and not VH and applicant stated that llamas produce both VHH and VH, which are more similar to conventional VH domains of VH-VL pairs (see bridging paragraph of pages 14-15 of the specification). Examiner Helms questioned how the claimed VH llama antibodies are different from VHH llama antibodies and how steps (a)-(e) differ from the prior art to produce a VH llama antibody that is distinguishable from the prior art. The interchangeability of the terms "VH" and "VHH" in the prior art as well as in applicant's disclosure and claims (i.e., "VH or VHH"; claims 26-28) to refer to the same variable heavy domain from camelids remains ambiguous. Applicant indicated that a response addressing the above issues and the previous Office Action mailed 5/3/2005 will be submitted.

Respectively,  
David Blanchard  
571-272-0827



LARRY R. HELMS, PH.D  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

050722 05:58 MAIL 370 050

INTERNATIONAL  
MAIL  
HIC 000 87 9801  
PERMIT NO. 986  
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 22314

TC1600  
REMSEN  
STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
AN EQUAL-OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER  
23 RECEIVED  
AUG 5 2005  
TECH CENTER 1600/2900



RETURNED FOR  
ADD'L POSTAGE  
WHEN REMAINING CROSS OUT THIS  
NOTICE OR PASTE STAMPS OVER IT

Business  
For Private Use, \$300

1450  
Ina, VA. 22313-1450  
Deliverable Return in Ten Days

MOVED / UNKNOWN / DAMAGE / INCONNU  
RETURN TO SENDER  
RENOVOI A.L. EXPEDITEUR  
VA 22313  
USA